

71. (New) The display of claim 63 wherein said part of said bus line is aligned with said side edge of said counter substrate and said side edge of said TFT substrate.

72. (New) The display of claim 64 wherein said part of said bus line is aligned with said side edge of said counter substrate and said side edge of said TFT substrate.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the September 26, 2000 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Amendment to the Title

The title has been amended herein to better describe the invention. Applicant respectfully requests entry and approval of the new title.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §§ 102 and 103

Claims 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,148,301 issued to Sawatsubashi, et al. The rejection asserts that Sawatsubashi teaches each element of the claims. Claims 57-60 are canceled herein. Claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12-14, 24, 25, 42-44, 49, 50, 55, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawatsubashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,610,742 issued to Hinata, et al. The rejection asserts that Sawatsubashi teaches each element of the claims except for a non-conductive or weakly conductive material applied to the side edge of the TFT substrate, which is taught by Hinata.

The present invention is directed toward a bus line connected with at least one pixel TFT. Further, a nonconductive or weakly conductive material is applied to a part of the bus line located adjacent to a side edge of a TFT substrate. The material is also applied to the side edge of the TFT substrate and the side edge of the counter substrate. The nonconductive or weakly conductive material may then protect the pixel TFT from a static charge.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests the structure of the present invention. Sawatsubashi does not teach any use of a nonconductive or weakly conductive material. Hinata suggests using a gas barrier film such as epoxy. However, ¹⁾Hinata

never suggests using a pixel TFT. Although the rejection asserts it would have been obvious to combine Sawatsubashi and Hinata, no suggestion for such a combination exists. Hinata merely reduces poor display performance by the gas barrier film and does not suggest using the gas barrier to protect against static charge. Nothing in ²⁾ either Hinata or Sawatsubashi suggests protecting against static charge.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 17, 21-25, and 61-64 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 17, 21-25, and 61-64 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 17, 21-25, and 61-64.

Claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12-14, 26-56, and 64-72 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 17, 21-25, and 61-64, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12-14, 26-56, and 64-72 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12-14, 26-56, and 64-72.




Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/18/01


Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

SCH/smr

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No. 20985
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10062175.doc